9

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/610,097	06/30/2000	Kenneth C. Budka	BUDKA 5-1-1	3114

20593 7590 10/06/2003

ROBERT D MCKINNEY
114 STUART DRIVE
VIDALIA, LA 71373

EXAMINER	
MILLER, BRANDON J	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2683	9

DATE MAILED: 10/06/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/610,097	Applicant(s) BUDKA ET AL.
	Examiner Brandon J Miller	Art Unit 2683

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *10 July 2003* .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-26* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-26* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-7, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Honkasalo in view of Barnett.

Regarding claim 1 Honkasalo teaches a system having a base station transmitter for transmitting data blocks to one or more mobile station over a radio link (see col. 4, lines 26-30). Honkasalo teaches determining a transmit power level at which to transmit a current block (see col. 4, lines 26-41). Honkasalo teaches receiving a quality measurement from a mobile station indicating an average radio link quality over a given measurement interval for a previous group of blocks (see col. 7, lines 60-67), wherein not all of the previous group of blocks were necessarily transmitted at the same transmit power level (see abstract and col. 8, lines 44-67). Honkasalo teaches determining a transmit power attenuation level for a current block based on a quality measurement (see abstract, col. 8, lines 25-67 and col. 9, lines 1-5). Honkasalo teaches for each block subtracting the transmit power attenuation level from a given transmit power level used for transmitting one or more blocks of a group to determine the transmit power level for a current block (see abstract, col. 8, lines 25-67, col. 9, lines 1-5 and col. 12, lines 36-50). Honkasalo teaches transmit power calculated for a packet that is divided into a group of blocks

(see col. 7, lines 45-50). Honkasalo does not teach a transmit attenuation level for each current block of a subsequent group of blocks as a function of a minimum of a first attenuation factor and a second attenuation factor. Barnett teaches determining a transmit attenuation level as a function of a minimum of a first attenuation factor and a second attenuation factor (see col. 6, lines 23-27 and col. 10, lines 35-50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the device adapt to include a transmit attenuation level for each current block of a subsequent group of blocks as a function of a minimum of a first attenuation factor and a second attenuation factor because this would allow for dynamic transmit power control that can control transmission power levels of bursts of communication signals.

Regarding claim 2 Honkasalo teaches a system that is a general packet radio serve (GPRS) system (see col. 4, lines 35-40).

Regarding claim 3 Honkasalo teaches different power control modes, and a given transmit power level that is a maximum transmit power level (see abstract, col. 3, lines 24-36, col. 4, lines 64-67 and col. 5, lines 15-18).

Regarding claim 4 Honkasalo teaches a maximum transmit power level that is a broadcast common control channel transmit power level minus a power level assigned to a mobile station during establishment of a downlink temporary block flow (see abstract, col. 5, lines 56-63 and col. 6, lines 8-15).

Regarding claim 5 Honkasalo teaches a current block to be transmitted on a timeslot and a quality measurement that indicates the average radio link quality over a previous group of blocks also transmitted on a timeslot (see col. 4, lines 27-35, col. 7, lines 48-67, and col. 8, lines 48-63).

Regarding claim 6 Honkasalo teaches transmitting a current block at a transmit power level (see abstract and col. 12, lines 36-50).

Regarding claim 7 Honkasalo teaches a device as recited in claim 1 except for during transmission of a last block of a previous group of blocks, polling a mobile station for a quality measurement by setting a poll bit in a last block. Honkasalo does teach during transmission of a data packet, polling a mobile station for a quality measurement (see col. 4, lines 58-63). Honkasalo does teach a packet that is divided into a group of blocks (see col. 7, lines 45-50). Even though Honkasalo does not specifically polling a mobile station for a quality measurement by setting a poll bit in a last block it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to make the invention adapt to include during transmission of a last block of a previous group of blocks, polling a mobile station for a quality measurement by setting a poll bit in a last block because this would be advantageous when the average length of a data block is long enough to cause considerable delay.

Regarding claim 20 Honkasalo teaches a base station that determines a transmit power level for transmitting a group of blocks in a downlink (see col. 4, lines 26-30). Honkasalo teaches receiving from a mobile station, a measurement report for a group of blocks over a measurement interval (see col. 4, lines 58-63). Honkasalo teaches calculating compensations to be made to transmit power levels as a function of an attenuation level. Honkasalo teaches transmit power calculated for a packet that is divided into a group of blocks (see col. 7, lines 45-50). Honkasalo does not teach compensations to be made to a transmit power level as a function of a minimum of two attenuation levels; or transmitting each block based on the minimum of two attenuation levels. Barnett teaches a transmit attenuation level as a function of a minimum of a

first attenuation factor and a second attenuation factor (see col. 6, lines 23-27 and col. 10, lines 35-50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the invention adapt to include compensations to be made to a transmit power level as a function of a minimum of two attenuation levels; or transmitting each block based on the minimum of two attenuation levels because this would allow for dynamic transmit power control that can control transmission power levels of bursts of communication signals.

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Honkasalo in view of Barnett and Laakso.

Regarding claim 15 Honkasalo teaches determining a transmit power level for a data packet that is divided into blocks (see col. 7, lines 45-50). Honkasalo teaches calculating, based on measurements of a packet reported by a mobile station over a given measurement interval, an attenuation factor indicating estimating downlink attenuation tolerable by a mobile station (see col. 8, lines 59-67 and col. 9, lines 1-5). Honkasalo does not teach an acceptable bit error rate, calculating a second attenuation factor indicating an estimated additional downlink attenuation to be applied to a first attenuation factor, or determining a transmit power attenuation level by taking a minimum of a first and second attenuation factors. Barnett teaches calculating a second attenuation factor and determining a transmit attenuation level by taking a minimum of a first and second attenuation factors (see col. 6, lines 23-27 and col. 10, lines 35-50). Laakso teaches achieving an estimated bit error rate (see col. 19, lines 56-59). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the device adapt to include an acceptable bit error rate, calculating a second attenuation factor indicating an estimated additional downlink attenuation to be applied to a first attenuation factor, and

determining a transmit power attenuation level by taking a minimum of a first and second attenuation factors because this would allow for dynamic transmit power control that can control transmission power levels of bursts of communication signals.

Claims 8-13, 16-19, and 21-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Honkasalo in view of Barnett, Laakso and Andersson.

Regarding claim 8 Honkasalo teaches a current group of blocks to be transmitted on a timeslot and a quality measurement that indicates an average radio link quality over the previous group of blocks transmitted (see col. 4, lines 27-35, col. 7, lines 48-67). Honkasalo teaches calculating an attenuation factor represented as a radio link (see col. 6, lines 52-58). Honkasalo teaches achieving an acceptable error rate (see col. 9, lines 31-34 and col. 11, lines 35-42). Honkasalo teaches determining the transmit power attenuation level (see col. 6, lines 48-62 and col. 8, lines 25-67). Honkasalo teaches a radio link attenuation level indicating the downlink attenuation that the mobile station can tolerate (see col. 8, lines 59-67 and col. 9, lines 1-5). Honkasalo does not teach calculating a second attenuation factor, representing an uplink control flag attenuation level indicating an estimated additional downlink attenuation that can be applied such that adequate uplink state performance is achieved, taking the minimum of a radio attenuation level to determine transmit power attenuation, achieving an acceptable bit error rate or a control flag. Barnett teaches a transmit attenuation level as a function of a first attenuation factor and a second attenuation factor and taking a minimum of an attenuation level (see col. 6, lines 23-27 and col. 10, lines 35-50). Laakso teaches determining an uplink control attenuation level for a current block which indicates an estimated additional downlink attenuation that can be applied such that adequate uplink state performance is achieved (see col. 20, lines 48-67 and col.

21, lines 1-6). Laakso teaches achieving an estimated bit error rate (see col. 19, lines 56-59). Andersson teaches a flag that is a power control indicator (see col. 9, lines 6-10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the invention adapt to include calculating a second attenuation factor, representing an uplink control flag attenuation level indicating an estimated additional downlink attenuation that can be applied such that adequate uplink state performance is achieved, taking the minimum of a radio attenuation level to determine transmit power attenuation, achieving an acceptable bit error rate or a control flag because this would allow for an arrangement of transmitted data that would cause the available data communication capacity can be maximally utilized.

Regarding claim 9 Honkasalo, Barnett, Laakso and Andersson teach a device as recited in claim 8 except for setting an uplink control flag attenuation level to a maximum attenuation level, it there is no active uplink temporary block flows on a timeslot. Barnett teaches a value corresponding to a maximum attenuation level (see col. 5, lines 36-37). Laakso does teach determining an uplink control attenuation level for a current block which indicates that can be applied such that adequate uplink state performance is achieved (see col. 20, lines 48-67 and col. 21, lines 1-6). Andersson does teach a flag that is a power control indicator (see col. 9, lines 6-10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to invention adapt to include setting an uplink control flag attenuation level to a maximum attenuation level, it there is no active uplink temporary block flows on a timeslot because this would allow for dynamic control of a desired attenuation level.

Regarding claim 10 Honkasalo teaches an attenuation level that is determined in accordance with an optimal radio link attenuation level and an effective attenuation level (see col. 6, lines 50-65).

Regarding claim 11 Honkasalo teaches determining a transmit power attenuation level for a current block sent in accordance with an attenuation level to a mobile station over a given measurement interval (see abstract, col. 6, lines 48-65, and col. 8, lines 36-67). Honkasalo teaches determining a radio link attenuation level for a data block based on an effective attenuation level and an optimal radio link attenuation level (see col. 6, lines 50-65). Honkasalo also teaches achieving an acceptable error rate (see col. 9, lines 31-34 and col. 11, lines 35-42). Honkasalo does not teach an optimal radio link attenuation level being estimated based on a confidence factor representing the confidence that is the estimated optimal radio link attenuation level. Laakso teaches an estimated error rate (see col. 19, lines 56-59). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the device adapt to include an optimal radio link attenuation level being estimated based on a confidence factor representing the confidence that is the estimated optimal radio link attenuation level because this would allow for dynamic control of a desired attenuation level.

Regarding claim 12 Honkasalo teaches caching, at a downlink for a mobile station, the radio link attenuation level (see col. 6, lines 55-60). Honkasalo teaches updating a mobile station of changes in transmission power according to a time that has passed from transmission of a previous packet (see col. 3, lines 65-67 and col. 4, lines 1-10). Honkasalo teaches retrieving cached information (see col. 8, lines 28-34) and adjusting a cached radio link attenuation level to account for an elapsed time (see col. 6, lines 54-58 and col. 8, lines 48-67). Honkasalo teaches

setting the radio link attenuation level for a next transmission in accordance with a cached radio link attenuation level (see col. 6, lines 50-62).

Regarding claim 13 Honkasalo, Barnett, Laakso, and Andersson teach a device as recited in claim 9 except for incrementing an uplink control flag attenuation level if, in a specified number of blocks, there have been no new uplink TBF's and no USF flag errors and no changes in uplink control flag attenuation. Honkasalo does teach incrementing an uplink control attenuation level in a specified number of blocks (see col. 6, lines 55-63). Andersson does teach a flag that is a power control indicator (see col. 9, lines 6-10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the invention adapt to include incrementing an uplink control flag attenuation level if, in a specified number of blocks, there have been no new uplink TBF's and no USF flag errors and no changes in uplink control flag attenuation because this would allow dynamic control of a desired attenuation level.

Regarding claim 16 Honkasalo teaches calculating an attenuation factor represented as a radio link (see col. 6, lines 52-58). Honkasalo teaches achieving an acceptable error rate (see col. 9, lines 31-34 and col. 11, lines 35-42). Honkasalo teaches determining the transmit power attenuation level (see col. 6, lines 48-62 and col. 8, lines 25-67). Honkasalo teaches a radio link attenuation level indicating the downlink attenuation that the mobile station can tolerate (see col. 8, lines 59-67 and col. 9, lines 1-5). Honkasalo does not teach a second attenuation factor that is an uplink control flag attenuation level indicating an estimated additional downlink attenuation that can be applied such that adequate uplink state performance is achieved, or achieving an acceptable bit error rate or an control flag. Barnett teaches a transmit attenuation level as a function of a first attenuation factor and a second attenuation factor (see col. 6, lines 23-27 and

col. 10, lines 35-50). Laakso teaches determining an uplink control attenuation level for a current block which indicates an estimated additional downlink attenuation that can be applied such that adequate uplink state performance is achieved (see col. 20, lines 48-67 and col. 21, lines 1-6). Laskso teaches achieving an estimated bit error rate (see col. 19, lines 56-59). Andersson teaches a flag that is a power control indicator (see col. 9, lines 6-10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the invention adapt to include calculating a second attenuation factor that is an uplink control flag attenuation level indicating an estimated additional downlink attenuation that can be applied such that adequate uplink state performance is achieved, achieving an acceptable bit error rate or an control flag because this would allow for an arrangement of transmitted data that would cause the available data communication capacity can be maximally utilized.

Regarding claim 17 Honkasalo, Barnett, Laakso and Andersson teach a device as recited in claim 16 except for each block of a group that is to be transmitted on a timeslot at a time, and calculating a second attenuation factor that includes setting an uplink control flag attenuation level to a maximum attenuation level, if there are no active uplink temporary block flow on a timeslot. Honkasalo does teach a current block to be transmitted on a timeslot at a particular time and a quality measurement that indicates the average radio link quality over a previous group of blocks also transmitted on a timeslot (see col. 4, lines 27-35, col. 8, lines 48-63). Honkasalo does teach setting uplink attenuation level to a higher attenuation level (see col. 6, lines 55-62). Barnett does teach a second attenuation factor (see col. 6, lines 23-27 and col. 10, lines 35-50). Andersson does teach a flag that is a power control indicator (see col. 9, lines 6-10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

made to make the device adapt to include each block of a group that is to be transmitted on a timeslot at a time, and calculating a second attenuation factor that includes setting an uplink control flag attenuation level to a maximum attenuation level, if there are no active uplink temporary block flow on a timeslot because this would allow for dynamic control of a desired attenuation level.

Regarding claim 18 Honkasalo teaches calculating an attenuation factor and determining a radio link attenuation level for a data block based on an effective attenuation level and an optimal radio link attenuation level (see col. 6, lines 50-65). Honkasalo teaches determining a transmit power attenuation level for a current block sent in accordance with an attenuation level to a mobile station over a given measurement interval (see col. 6, lines 48-65 and col. 8, lines 36-67). Honkasalo also teaches achieving an acceptable error rate (see col. 9, lines 31-34 and col. 11, lines 35-42). Honkasalo does not teach an optimal radio link attenuation level being estimated based on a target bit error rate and a mean bit error experienced by a mobile station. Laakso teaches achieving an estimated bit error rate (see col. 19, lines 56-59). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the device adapt to include an optimal radio link attenuation level being estimated based on a target bit error rate and a mean bit error experienced by a mobile station because this would allow for dynamic control of a desired attenuation level.

Regarding claim 19 Honkasalo teaches an radio link attenuation level that is determined based on an effective attenuation level (see col. 6, lines 50-65).

Regarding claim 21 Honkasalo teaches achieving an acceptable error rate (see col. 9, lines 31-34 and col. 11, lines 35-42). Honkasalo does not teach determining a first attenuation

level of two attenuation levels, the first attenuation level representing a maximum attenuation level, determining a second attenuation level of two attenuation levels, the second attenuation level representing a maximum attenuation level, an uplink state flag, or suitable error rate performance. Barnett teaches determining a first attenuation level of two attenuation levels and determining a second attenuation level of two attenuation levels (see col. 10, lines 35-41). Barnet teaches a maximum attenuation level representing a maximum attenuation level (see col. 5, lines 336-37). Laakso teaches achieving a suitable error rate performance (see col. 19, lines 56-59). Andersson does teach a flag that is a power control indicator (see col. 9, lines 6-10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the device adapt to include determining a first attenuation level of two attenuation levels, the first attenuation level representing a maximum attenuation level, determining a second attenuation level of two attenuation levels, the second attenuation level representing a maximum attenuation level, an uplink state flag, or suitable error rate performance because this would allow for transmit power to be continuously changed between a maximum level and a minimum level.

Regarding claim 22 Honkasalo teaches determining an attenuation level based on a quality measurement reported by a mobile station (see col. 6, lines 50-60). Barnett teaches a transmit attenuation level as a function of a minimum of a first attenuation factor and a second attenuation factor (see col. 6, lines 23-27 and col. 10, lines 35-50).

Regarding claim 23 Honkasalo teaches determining an attenuation level based on a quality measurement reported by a mobile station (see col. 6, lines 50-60). Honkasalo teaches a desired link quality for a base station for downlink transmission (see col. 3, lines 24-35). Barnett

teaches a transmit attenuation level as a function of a minimum of a first attenuation factor and a second attenuation factor (see col. 6, lines 23-27 and col. 10, lines 35-50).

Regarding claim 24 Honkasalo teaches determining an attenuation level based power levels used to transmit a particular block of data of a previous block over a measurement interval (see col. 4, lines 57-63, col. 6, lines 55-59, and col. 7, lines 46-49). Barnett teaches a transmit attenuation level as a function of a minimum of a first attenuation factor and a second attenuation factor (see col. 6, lines 23-27 and col. 10, lines 35-50).

Regarding claim 25 Honkasalo teaches a compensation factor that compensates for different power levels used to transmit a particular block over a measurement interval (see col. 8, lines 60-67 and col. 9, lines 1-4).

Regarding claim 26 Honkasalo teaches determining an attenuation level based on a factor that quantifies a value in an optimal attenuation level estimate, the factor based on one of the different transmit power levels used for transmitting the group of blocks over a given measurement interval (see col. 4, lines 57-63, col. 6, lines 50-59, and col. 7, lines 46-49). Honkasalo does not teach a second attenuation level or an attenuation level that indicates that transmit power should be increased or decreased. Barnett teaches a second attenuation level or an attenuation level that indicates that transmit power should be increased or decreased (see col. 6, lines 23-27 and col. 10, lines 35-50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the device adapt to include a second attenuation level or an attenuation level that indicates that transmit power should be increased or decreased because this would allow for transmit power to be continuously changed between a maximum level and a minimum level.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-13 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Hagerman U.S. Patent 6,539,010 discloses a downlink power control and adaptive beamforming for half-rate radio communication systems.

Tsunehara U.S. Patent 6,307,844 discloses a CDMA communication system and its transmission power control method.

Esmailzadeh, U.S. Patent 6,43,296 discloses power control in a cdma mobile communications system.

Mazur, U.S. Patent 6,072,792 discloses a power control apparatus, and an associated method, for TDMA transmitter.

Borg, U.S. Patent 5,669,066 discloses dynamic control or transmitting power at a transmitter and attenuation at a receiver.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brandon J Miller whose telephone number is 703-305-4222. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 8:00 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Trost can be reached on 703-308-5318. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

***

W.T.

WILLIAM TROST
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600